



IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Application of: Richard D. Bonaduce)

Filed: 2/15/2002)

Serial No.: 10/076,927)

For: **Omnidirectional handlebar Reflector Insert**

Group Art Unit: 2872

Examiner: Mark A. Robinson

MS Non-Fee Amendment
Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2800

SEP - 5 2003

RECEIVED

Response to Office Action

Sir:

This Response is filed addressing the issues raised in the Office Action dated 7/10//2003, regarding the above-noted application for patent. The Applicant submits that, in light of the remarks below, the application is in proper condition for allowance. The Applicant respectfully requests the examiner allow the patent to proceed to issue.

REMARKS

Claims

The Examiner's sole rejection stated in the office action is based upon 35 USC § 103 (a) with claims 1-3 being unpatentable over Sanger in view of Sargis. In many aspects, the Examiner is correct in identifying some similarity, but the two patents, alone or read in combination, do not provide a basis to substantiate his rejection. The MPEP provides the following standard to maintain a rejection based upon Section 103 as follows:

"To establish a prima facie case of obviousness, three basic criteria must be met. First, there must be some suggestion or motivation, either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art, to modify the reference or to combine reference teachings. Second, there must be a reasonable expectation of success. Finally, the prior art reference (or references when combined) must teach or suggest all the claim limitations. The teaching or